APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Α.	REPORT COMPLETIC	N DATE FOR APPROVED	JURISDICTIONAL	DETERMINATION (J	JD): <u>2/9/2009</u> .
----	------------------	---------------------	----------------	------------------	------------------------

Name of water being evaluated on this JD form: Wetland A and Stormwater Features 1 & 2
PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION: State: Washington County: Clark City: Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat: 45.6803 N, Long: 122.6304 W Universal Transverse Mercator: Name of nearest waterbody: Cougar Creek. Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 17080001. Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request. Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc.) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form. List other JDs:
REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): Office (Desk) Determination. Date: 11-10-2008. Field Determination. Date(s): 10-29-2008.
CTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
re Are no "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the ew area. [Required] Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide. Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce. Explain:
CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.
re Are no "waters of the U.S." within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required
1. Waters of the U.S. a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply): TNWs, including territorial seas Wetlands adjacent to TNWs Relatively permanent waters² (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs Impoundments of jurisdictional waters Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands
b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area: Non-wetland waters: linear feet width (ft) and/or acres. Wetlands: acres.
c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Pick List and Pick List Elevation of established OHWM (if known):
2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable): ³ Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional. Explain: Wetland A is a small depressional wetland with no apparent surface outlet to waters of the US. The nearest RPW is approximately 3300 feet away. Hydrology for the wetland comes from surface runoff and stormwater from

Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F.

Version 2-8-08 Isolated & Non-Waters Only

1 of 3

wetland dries up early in the summer. The nearest TNW is approximately 2 miles away. It is very unlikely water from this wetland would get into waters of the U.S., even during an extreme flood. Between the wetland and the nearest water of the U.S. is mostly residential with some pasture and a small amount of forest offering little in the way of habitat. Wetland A is unlikely to be used for interstate commerce. There is not enough water during the summer to provide irrigation. The forested area has some older possibly commercially viable trees, but harvest would greatly reduce the value of the area as a county park. The two stormwater features on the property are limited to the immediate area surrounding and are incidental to the stormwater structures. Vegetation in those areas is dominated by opportunistic wetland plants such as cottonwoods.

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

E.

F.

- A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs: NOT APPLICABLE
- B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS: NOT APPLICABLE
- C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION: NOT APPLICABLE
- D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE: NOT APPLICABLE

ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY): which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes. from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce. which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce. Interstate isolated waters. Explain: Other factors. Explain:
Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:
Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply): Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft). Other non-wetland waters: acres. Identify type(s) of waters: Wetlands: acres.
NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS, INCLUDING WETLANDS: If potential wetlands were assessed within the review area, these areas did not meet the criteria in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual and/or appropriate Regional Supplements. Review area included isolated waters with no substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce. Prior to the Jan 2001 Supreme Court decision in "SWANCC," the review area would have been regulated based solely on the "Migratory Bird Rule" (MBR). Other: (explain, if not covered above): Wetland features associated with stormwater outfall.
Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the sole potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR factors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional judgment (check all that apply): Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft). Lakes/ponds: acres. Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource: Wetlands: acres.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference sources below):

Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant: _____.

⁴ Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.

\boxtimes	Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.				
	Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.				
	Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.				
	Data sheets prepared by the Corps:				
	Corps navigable waters' study:				
	U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:				
	USGS NHD data.				
	USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.				
	U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name:				
	USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey. Citation:				
\boxtimes	National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:				
\boxtimes	State/Local wetland inventory map(s):				
	FEMA/FIRM maps:				
	100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodectic Vertical Datum of 1929)				
\boxtimes	Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date): Google				
	or Other (Name & Date):				
	Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:				
	Applicable/supporting case law:				
	Applicable/supporting scientific literature:				
	Other information (please specify):				

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD: On December 31, 2008, the EPA concurred with our findings. Corps HQ did not provide a response.